Sirica-Windowdressing: Today's Times and Post stories illustrate this further. He made infantile gestures toward the proper questioning of Sloan, got to where he should have pressed diligently from his own pretenses, and asked the wrong questions or none, which is the WC method all over again. He should have questioned the preosecutor on these points, too, as did you ask Mitchell if he knew what the money was being spent for? Stans? why do you not list them as witnesses? Sirica failed to ask Liddy about whom Liddy was talking about in saying he'd promised "them" he'd not use committee employees, the glaringly obvious question. For the prosecutor, once he'd gotten this from Liddy in the FBI reports, if he could not find out any other way which committee employee(s) Liddy referred to, it was simplicity itself to send the FBI to each or call each in. He should have. Clearly he did not. This faking judge is faking, taking points that he knows will attract press interest and going the wrong way with them , in pretended vigor. He has conned them. It simply is incredible that Sloan will for no reason at all direct committee employees not to engaged in illegal activities. Who would suppose for no reason that any would? Nor could Sloan or any other GOP have had any doubt about the meaning of what Liddy said once it was known, as it was much earlier known, that the five had been arrested. That there was no conference on this alone is beyond belief-first thing in the a.m. at the very latest...Liddy is continuingly referred to as the man in charge. There is to date nothing I have seen in the reporting to indicate that he was more than paymaster. The difference is that Hunt was on the White House payroll, much more tender. I don't know of a single supervisory thing attributed to Liddy, a single recruitment, a single policy decision -not one thing to say he's boss...If either or both defense counsel failed to questions some witnesses, there is sufficient characterization of the prosecutive effort, very, very deficient. However, for no reason apparent for the story, the prosecutor went out of his way to denounce a Jack Anderson story about the wrong intials allegedly on an unidentified piece of evidence. What difference does this make to the prosecution? The jury is sequestered, there is no possible criticism of the FBI agents allegedly intialling, and there is no possibility of harm to the prosecution or justice. What also is not possible if the facts are as Silbert is quoted as saying, is that the FBI was not responsible for the leak, unless it was Silbert's own office...How the papers can't tumble to what is being pulled, with them the instrumentality, how some lawyer known to some paper hasn't wised any up, escapes me. I can't believe this is innocent. Meyer has been lacing his copy with suggestions, including today, re Liddy and the inadequate judicial questioning, but leaving it there. ...For what Sirica has so often said so loudly, it seems strange he has not once asked the prosecutor, "Why isn't this in the indictment?" HW 1/24/73